



they hated. It was the exercise of those rights, it was the liberty he breathed, they sought to stifle. For the purpose of destroying this liberty, they break his press and require him to be silent or flee from Alton. He might have saved his life but at the expense of that which is dearer than life.

The contest was for the liberty of the nation, for the rights of Christianity. Was it a successful one? The death of Lovejoy does not prove it otherwise. If the red blood which that death has sent through the land shall have the effect it ought to have, it will prove a profitable sacrifice. God forbid that any act of mine should hinder it. But whether this nation is aroused to repentance or not, the warning prophet of God has cleansed his skirts from our blood by shedding his own.

I agree with you, Sir, that the truth is to be vindicated rather than the character of man; that no esteem for Mr. Lovejoy is to induce us to evict him. I should also deprecate the use of violence in the cause of abolition. Love to the slave and his master urge us to the use of pacific means in all direct efforts at emancipation. But the love of truth forbids me to condemn Mr. Lovejoy. The positions upon which I predicate his defense are, that human government, by its protecting power, is capable of subverting the cause of philanthropy; that the sword is an appropriate instrument for human government. That the power, as well as of learning or wealth of this world, is to Christ, and that the man with whose care it is intrusted, cannot innocently withhold its protecting aid to the cause of christian liberty and truth; and finally, that it was not an abolitionist, that Lovejoy took arms; but as one entrusted with the power of government, and under obligations to use that power to protect the servant and rights of his heavenly master from violent destruction.

I have thought that the gathering providences of God indicated the necessity of the act, and declare it to have been done from love of truth, and reverence for the command of heaven.

Circumstances forbid my illustrating these positions with the clearness and force of which they are susceptible. But they seem to me entitled to serious consideration, and to justify me in making such suggestions of them to your notice as I have been able to do. I trust you will excuse the feebleness with which they are presented; and be assured that they are uttered with the kindest feelings towards yourself; and with entire consciousness of the reverence due to my venerable antagonist and friend.

#### AN ABOLITIONIST.

#### AMERICAN REPUBLICANISM IN EUROPE.

The following instructive and highly interesting letter from our esteemed friend, DAVID LEE CHILD, who has recently returned from Europe, was read at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and ordered to be printed in the Liberator.

BOSTON, Jan. 23, 1838.

To Messrs. Garrison and Phelps, Committee of Arrangements, &c.

DEAR BROTHERS:

I regret that it will not be convenient for me to attend the anniversary meeting of our Society, for the purpose of taking a part in its proceedings. Do not suppose that this is owing to any abatement of interest or trust in our great cause; on the contrary, the cause seems to me to have so shot ahead within the last fifteen months, that you are in no small danger of receiving aid and countenance from the prudent and politic. You are now, and perhaps have been for some time, more likely to be joined by false brethren, than to be deserted by the true.

It has been my lot, during the period above mentioned, to learn much of the change which has taken place in the estimation in which we are held, as a nation, by enlightened and good men in Europe. Having formerly passed two years there, I was prepared to appreciate this change. At that time, the face of a liberal European would brighten at the name of 'American,' and he would seize the first moment of conversation, to express his admiration and his hopes of our country. During my recent sojourn, I have heard very little interest expressed in us, except to have explanations and arguments suggested, by which it could be shown to Europe, that our conduct is not the consequence of our principles.

The leading causes of the change to which I refer, are,

1st. Our mobs.

2dly. The wider knowledge which, chiefly through their instrumentality, has been diffused in Europe, of the existence and horrors of American slavery.

3dly. Our treatment of the Aborigines.

In Great Britain, France, and Germany, we are regarded as the most cruel and rapacious people, since the times of Cortez and Pizarro.

Our treatment of the Aborigines appears the more odious, from the striking contrast which it exhibits with the present policy of other civilized and Christian nations.

The king of France has lately recalled the governor of French Guiana, and directed him to be brought to trial, for having issued orders to invade a settlement of runaway slaves, on the borders of that Province. The military commander is also ordered for trial by Court martial, for having executed those ordered, and put to death some of those poor people.

A quarrel lately arose between the Caffres and the British colonists of the Cape of Good Hope. The governor of the Cape, at the head of the British forces, invaded the Caffre country, slaughtered many of the inhabitants, and overrun the territory of a native chief, and annexed it to the Province. Dr. Phillip, the father of the christian missions to that quarter, left the Cape in company with the deposed chief, and arrived last summer in England. At that time, a society had just been formed, called 'the Aborigines Protection Society,' of which the British Anti-Slavery leader in the House of Commons, Mr. Fowell Buxton, is President. This society examined the case, and having satisfied themselves that the colonists were the aggressors, and that the injuries for which the British arms had been carried into the Caffre country, were committed in retaliation for manifest and unprovoked wrongs, done to the natives by their Christian neighbors, they joined their representations to those of Dr. Phillip. These were so effectual with the government of the young and virtuous queen, that orders were immediately issued for restoring the conquered territory to its native sovereign and lawful proprietors, and a humane and upright man was sent out to supersede the Governor.

These bright examples, while they illustrate the justice and magnanimity of the people and rulers who have given them, react with a withering effect upon a people who have expended \$20,000,000, and are rapidly expending more, in slaughtering red men, and kidnapping them under the sacred form of a *flag of truce*, in order to rob them not of their lands only, but also of their children.

At the request of a French literary gentleman, and of a member of the Chamber of Deputies, I reduced to writing some considerations, previously stated in conversation, tending to show that, whatever might be the apparent, there was no real foundation for the scoffs and exultation of European despots and sympathizers over the wounds which freedom has received in the house of her friends in America. I submit the following extract:

"By what I have heard from you, and from others since I arrived in Europe, I see that the

disorders, which have occurred in the United States, and remain without punishment, have disheartened the friends of civil and religious liberty, and encouraged its foes. You have not, I say, wherewith to reply to those who cite those disorders in answer to the theory of human rights. This complaint will wring the hearts of many Americans, and perhaps it may shame some.

I can only say, on this subject, as I did at the house of M. Garnier Pages [the republican leader in the Chamber of Deputies,] that though I must confess the existence of great evils and crimes, and that they are of a nature to be particularly disgraceful to a republic, yet it is only in a republic, with a perfectly free press, freedom of speech, and freedom of *association*, that such potent means could have been so rapidly and extensively organized, and employed by a few of the comparatively weak to expose the corruption and oppression of the strong, to rebuke them openly, and to call upon them to forsake iniquity, and what is more irritating, upon the people to forsake them.

The difference between republics and other forms of society where there is a free press, and monarchies where the press is tampered, is principally this; that in the former, though evils and abuses incident to human nature may exist, and gather strength for a time, yet there is a remedy in a free press and an enlightened public sentiment, which is sure to overtake them sooner or later, and to deal with them according to their nature and aggravation; whereas in other governments the evils are the same or worse, but without any remedy. It is true that the extreme publicity, which vice and misrule obtain in America through its free press, presents them in such bold relief, and under such odious aspects, that many good and liberal men are tempted to believe that American republicans are 'sinners above all other men.' Yet if the freedom of the press, of speech, and of *association*, (for without the last, reformers will always lack the means of employing the first,) were as great under other governments, it would only be found in the upshot, that among our American evils, we have not that master one, of losing the right to 'resist evil.'

Was it ever seen before in the whole history of the human race, that comparatively few persons, most of them young men and weak women, were carrying on in the midst of a powerful and high-spirited nation, a reform going to the foundation of their social organization, and opposed to the vehement wishes and supposed interests of ninety-nine hundredths of that nation, including government, legislature, judges, priests, lawyers, doctors, brokers, merchants, manufacturers, office-seekers, office-holders, editors, demagogues, and the lowest rabble; and yet the agis of good laws was so far sacred that, as a general thing, it preserved their lives and protected their labors?

Let those who take occasion from our American mobs to calumniate our American principles, show another nation in which this spectacle could have been witnessed. What would have been the fate of the missionaries and friends of man in the British West India Islands, if those colonies had been independent? In any other country but our American republic, we abolitionists should have been massacred or burned alive like John Huss and Jerome of Prague, Savanisla, the Albigenes and the eight thousand victims of St. Bartholomew's. Luther had a powerful prince, as a constant protector. What if that prince had been as much against him, as the American people under a strong delusion have been against us?

I would further observe that those men, who trade in the flesh of their fellow-men, who buy and keep it, are tyrants and enemies of the human race; that republicanism is not in them, but that they are in fact its greatest foes; so that American slavery is in reality to be charged to the account of *despotism*, instead of *republicanism*. Republicanism must not be held to frown off against the *friendship*, as well as enmity of those men. Slaveholding and slave-trading Americans are a pretty fair copy of the ancient feudal masters of the people of Europe, not generally so ignorant as their prototypes, but all the worse for that, as their superior intelligence is employed in framing with ingenious cruelty worse laws than ever disgraced Goth and Vandals.

We have had frightful and fatal mobs, and what is still more mortifying, mobs excited to extinguish light and uphold slavery; but remember that fanaticism has had its periods in all nations, and that it is as strange and extravagant in the forms which it takes as in the deeds that it does.

In France, a monarch, 'father of the people,' could burn at one time fifteen hundred of his children in a church; his brutal barons burned three hundred more in a castle at another; and these merely because they persisted in worshipping God according to what they believed to be his will. In the United States, a slaveholder of my acquaintance declared that sooner than emancipate, he would lock his hundred and fifty slaves in his house, and set fire to it! Who does not see that despotism is every where the same, whether exercised by such monsters as Louis, le Gros, and Simon de Moutort, or by an American republican slaveholder?

With best wishes,

Your friend and fellow servt.

D. LEE CHILD.

#### LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

PROVIDENCE, Feb. 11, 1838.

MY DEAR FRIEND GARRISON:

Among the distinguished friends of the anti-slavery cause, who were invited to attend the last annual meeting of the Rhode Island A. S. Society, was GERRIT SMITH. My letter of invitation was written at Scituate, and as I carelessly omitted to request him to direct his reply, if he should make one, to Providence, he very naturally concluded that it would reach me at the former place. In consequence of this mistake, the following letter was not received until the 9th inst. But, although it comes at this late period, the suggestions it contains are too good to be lost; and the high respect which the abolitionists of New England entertain for brother Smith's opinions induces me to send you a copy of it for publication. I omit, however, as unimportant, that portion of it which contains his apology for not attending our meeting.

Yours sincerely,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

—

PETERBORO, Oct. 26, 1837.

MY DEAR SIR:—\* \* \* \* \* I have not failed to notice the late conspicuous movements in New England, which affect the anti-slavery cause. I see that some of your pastors are offended at the public advocacy, by Sarah M. and Angelina E. Grimke, of the claims of impartial and universal liberty. Now, if these pastors wish our beloved sisters to be silent, that they may themselves be better heard in behalf of the enslaved poor;—if they would have them retire, only that greater room may be thus afforded for their own masculine and more powerful efforts in the cause of emancipation, then it is, at the most, nothing worse than a little egotism and vanity in which their complaints originated. But, if these pastors, whilst desiring the Grimkes to quit the field, have no intention to take themselves;—if they would have men also, as well as women, to be dumb in the cause of the dumb;—then, I say, let not the Grimkes only continue their advocacy;—let all the women of New England, and all the children too,—yes, and the very stones of your streets, lift up their cry for the oppressed, and keep it up, until her men have quit their hiding place,

and come up to the help of the Lord in this cause of crushed and perishing humanity. That one, who is doing nothing for the poor slave, and intending to do nothing for him, should be occupied in pronouncing criticisms on the efforts, which others are making for him, is about as unreasonable and imprudent, as it is for the cowardly traitor to be surveying from some place of security, which he has chosen for the purpose, the wrong evolutions, and to be counting up the mistakes of his countrymen, who are periling their all in the thickest of the battle.

The attacks on William Lloyd Garrison have, of course, gained my attention. Whatever may be the faults of that noble brother, I trust that abolitionists will never approve of the way taken by Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c., to correct them. If injustice had been done by Mr. Garrison to Mr. White and Mr. Blagden, that injustice should not have been seized on, as an occasion for destroying his influence and usefulness, and for producing a division in our ranks. It should have been complained of to Mr. Garrison himself: and the complaint, instead of being trumpeted forth to the damage of our cause and the exultation of its enemies, should have been made in such a manner as to show that they, who made it, tenderly regarded Mr. Garrison's feelings and reputation, and deeply felt the importance of preserving peace and harmony among abolitionists.

There is another point presented in the Appeal of Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c., on which I must say a few words. The true-hearted abolitionists will not consent, for one moment, that a minister of the gospel is at liberty to decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings.

The declining to read such notices is a well known branch of the system of means for suppressing the discussion of the question of slavery: and the minister, who is guilty of this delinquency, takes ground with Gov. Marcy and Gov. Everett and the mob.

I readily admit, that when in the pulpit of another, a minister should not knowingly violate the usages of that pulpit.

But if it be one of those usages, that a notice of a meeting for exhortation or prayer in behalf of the millions of our enslaved countrymen shall not be read, then does the minister sin greatly,

who, with this knowledge, accepts an invitation to officiate in such pulpit. He lends his sanction to the crime of stopping the ears 'at the cry of the poor.' Would he do so, were it his own wife and children, who are in bonds?

Oh no—he would 'remember them,' and wish all others to 'remember them.' His selfish heart can now forget the woes of the slave, because it is the wives and children of others, and not his own wife and children, into whose hearts the iron of slavery has entered.

But I have filled my sheet, and must stop. I took up my pen, simply to say, that I could not accept your invitation—and not to write to you about matters which you understand far better than I do.

I am, my dear Sir,

With great regard, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

#### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASS. A. S. SOCIETY.

FRIDAY, January 27.

While the Society were waiting for the committee of business to bring something before the meeting, Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience. But, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of consummate villainy, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, because I am black.



## LITERARY.

The following effusion is by a young lad, who has been sick from a child, and has never had the ordinary advantages of education—Nevertheless, he is more than a match for the Bishop. His rhyme, if destitute of high poetical merit, is at least characterized by good sense and sound moral discrimination. The address alluded to has already appeared in our columns—*Ed. Lib.*

## BISHOP HEADING'S ADDRESS.

Is this the land which men proclaim  
A land of liberty and fame?  
A land that's blest of all the earth,  
Where all her sons are free from birth?  
A land where milk and honey flow,  
Where balmy winds untainted blow—  
In short, to sum up all its worth,  
A second paradise on earth?  
Where is the man who dares to say,  
It does possess one glittering ray  
Of freedom, to dispel the gloom,  
More awful than the silent tomb,  
Which hovers round Columbia's shore,  
Where liberty is known no more?  
E'en Heading pleads with powerful zeal,  
The cause of those who dare to steal  
And shackle Africa's free-born race,  
And doom them as their beasts of chase;  
Force them to groan in servile chains,  
And rob them of their hard-earned gains.  
And, take his word just as he spoke them,  
That is, if I have not mistook them—  
He says that men may worship God,  
With hands fresh dipped in human blood;  
And even says, with brazen face,  
Until some man will slay the place  
Written by some old apostle grave,  
Which says, 'Thou shalt not own a slave?'  
He ne'er shall cease to think it right—  
But uses it on with all his might.  
Yea, Bishop Heading says 'tis right  
For Christian men, if they are white,  
To rob a race by nature free,  
Of all the joys of liberty;  
To chain the mind, destroy the soul,  
Till time itself shall cease to roll.  
And that our doubts may be removed,  
He even says that Christ approved  
Of murder, robbery, and chains,  
And selling souls for earthly gains.  
And is this Bishop such a dunce,  
So blind and stupid all at once,  
As thus to raise the hue and cry,  
And give to Christ himself the lie?  
For Christ to all mankind has said,  
As plain as language can be made,  
'Thou shalt not covet other's pelf;  
But love thy neighbor as thyself;  
But then to prove it lawful gain,  
He quotes from Matthew to explain  
That God allows the great and wise  
The poor and needy to despise;  
When the same scriptures plainly state,  
That God does not respect the great,  
More than the poor, oppressed and lame,  
But does love all mankind the same—  
In his own likeness made them all,  
Both black and white, both great and small.  
But Heading proves, as plain as day,  
The scriptures don't mean what they say!  
For Christ has said, 'To others do  
As you'd have others do to you.'  
But he has found, or else he guess'd,  
It means, the poor shall be oppressed.  
And if the slaves should 'e'er obtain  
Their freedom from oppression's chain,  
He says aloud, with doleful cry,  
'You do not as a man's be done by!'  
What? not to give a man his right,  
Because he's black, and you are white?  
In almost every age, it seems,  
The grand high priests have had their dreams,  
Or wakful visions full of spite,  
That black is not so good as white;  
E'en Aaron, his great predecessor,  
Although like Heading a professor,  
With horrid pictured in his face,  
He found that one of Ethip's race  
Ranked with the leaders of the Jews—  
And, horrid-stricken at the news,  
He sought for Miriam, his sister,  
With conscience scorching to a blister,  
And in a rage to her he stated  
How badly Moses had been mated—  
His wife, although of noble blood,  
A princess of the Median so,  
Yet she was deep immersed in sin—  
For why? She had a swarthy skin!  
A crime too great to be forgiven,  
Or to allow a seat in heaven:  
And both of them, with murmurs loud,  
Spread tumult through the listening crowd.  
To punish these two hughty scions,  
For sowing discord through the tribes,  
And murmuring at the works of God,  
He smote them with his chastening rod.  
Again, says Heading, those who speak  
Upon the first day of the week,  
And raise their voice and boldly plead  
For millions who are doomed to bleed  
Beneath a bloody tyrant's rod,  
And strangers to the word of God,  
They 'desecrate' the day of rest,  
By pleading for the poor oppressed!  
So cavilling scions and lawyers thought,  
When they the blessed Saviour caught  
Right in the act, one Sabbath day,  
Of healing one who sick'd lay;  
And they were filled with rage and ire,  
(The praise of men's sole desire)—  
And cried, affectedly distressed,  
'He deserves this day of rest!'  
And boldly sought how to destroy  
The Saviour, who dared thus employ  
The day in doing good to men,  
When they declared it was a sin.  
The Bishop says, should all men be  
Letting the oppressed go free,  
The sons of Ham would never find  
Religion to instruct their mind.  
To quote his words—he even said,  
Unless their minds to God were led  
By some sincere and christian brother,  
They all would go to hell together.  
But who would tell me, if you durst,  
Will answer for their souls at last?  
I'll leave you, sir, to solve this query  
In your own mind so cold and dreary—  
Upon whose head will rest the blame?  
But peradventure you'll exclaim,  
'Upon those men you seek to feter?'  
But why have you not taught them better?  
Pray, solve this well, within your mind,  
Ere you again address mankind.

For the Liberator.

## WHO MADE THE FIELDS?

Mother, who made the verdant field,  
The lofty trees and waving grass;  
The flowers that such sweet fragrance yield,  
To fill the air whence'er I pass?  
Twas God, my child; he made the earth,  
And all the beauteous things you see;  
He gives the humblest flowers their birth,  
And watches over you and me.  
Then God is good, and I will try  
To love and serve him, more, mamma;  
Although he lives beyond the sky,  
Will he not hear my prayer so far?  
He will, my child—our thoughts he sees,  
And every hidden secret thing;  
And d'infant voices always please  
The great and glorious heavenly King.  
And if you love him now he'll bless,  
And daily pour those favors down,  
More rich than feeble words express—  
And when you die your spirit crown.

J. S.

D. C. C.

## LITERARY, MISCELLANEOUS AND MORAL.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## COLONIZATION.

The Emancipator contains a letter from one of the anti-slavery agents now lecturing in Pennsylvania, Mr. Wm. H. Burleigh, dated 'Harrisburg, Jan. 29th.' As several copies of the Liberator circulate in that part of the country, we make the following extracts from Mr. B's letter—premising that it is a synopsis of a lecture delivered in Harrisburg by Dr. Booth, an agent of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society. 'It had been advertised that he would lecture upon colonization, but he did not speak a dozen sentences upon that topic during his harangue of an hour and a half.' Mr. Burleigh then adds—

He began by stating that there was too much 'morbid excitement' in the community upon the subject of slavery—that he labored to allay that excitement, and had been successful in doing it in many places, and hoped to succeed here. The colonization scheme, during its quiet operation for fifteen years, produced no excitement in the land, nor any injury to religion. He then gave us a brief history of slavery, commencing with the 'first slave,' Joseph, who was sold by his brethren, and from the history of Joseph, together with the subsequent account of the enslavement of the Israelites in Egypt, he inferred that 'slavery, under certain circumstances, may be in the providence of God'—but very correctly added that this rendered 'the wickedness of man none the less.' After speaking of the enslavement of the children of Israel by the Africans, he said—'Perhaps God has a controversy with that people for enslaving the Israelites and the Circassians.' Perhaps he has. What then? Why, if God has a controversy with Africa for enslaving the descendants of Abraham, he undoubtedly has a controversy with our nation for enslaving the descendants of Ham. God is not a partial judge. In the olden time he abhorred oppression, he abhors it none the less now. It cannot be less displeasing to Him when committed by Christian America than by pagan Africa.

Slavery, said Mr. Booth, was introduced into the American colonies under the sanction of Great Britain. It was absolutely forced on us, contrary to our will, through the cupidity of the mother country—and though Great Britain had done nobly, and was worthy of great praise, in that she had paid the planters in her colonies the full value for their slaves—it yet becomes her to be very modest in what she says to us. Slavery has existed here ever since the existence of the colonies, and though it is 'a sin, a curse, and a shame' yet God has greatly prospered and blessed us, notwithstanding its existence. Slavery exists to this day in Pennsylvania and New Jersey (Why don't you go to the South?)—the North has assisted in putting the South up to the South, and it therefore becomes the North to be very modest in what she says to the South. He then pretended to go into an examination of the question, whether slavery is under all circumstances sinful. He quoted Lev. xxv. 45th, and 46th verses, to prove that God not only permitted, but sanctioned and positively enjoined the system of slavery—perpetual slavery, among his own people—and it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fish & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of